

REMARKS

Claims 12-24 are pending in the application, claims 1-11 having been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant respectfully submits that the original disclosure supports the subject matter of claims 12-24. Specifically, claims 1-11 have been rewritten as new claims 12-22, respectively, for the purposes of clarification of the claimed subject matter (including clarification of the term "synchronized") and to place the claims, which are based on a translation of a foreign priority document, in format more appropriate for U.S. prosecution. The amendments are not meant to alter the intended scope of the claims (with the exception of omitting from claim 12 the recitation that the vehicle is an "automobile," as previously recited in claim 1 and now recited in claim 23). Claim 24 is supported in the original disclosure at, for example, page 6, lines 1-17 and Figure 2. For these reasons, approval and entry of the new claims are respectfully requested.

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended to address the formal objections raised by the Examiner. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (hereinafter "Section 103(a)") as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,736,935 to Lambropoulos (hereinafter "Lambropoulos") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,420,925 to Michaels (hereinafter "Michaels").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as it applies against original claims 1-11 and to the extent it applies against new claims 12-24.

As recited in original claim 1 and new claim 12, the invention is directed to a system for controlling locking/unlocking means of at least one openable panel of a

vehicle. The system comprises a vehicle transmission/reception means (3, 4, 5) carried by the vehicle for transmitting an interrogation signal, and a transmission/reception means (9, 10, 11) intended to be carried by a user for transmitting the response signal for controlling unlocking actuation of the operable panel.

Conventional locking/unlocking systems pose security problems due to their susceptibility to signal interception. For example, an "ill-intentioned" person may intercept and copy the interrogation signal from a vehicle transmission/reception means or the response signal from a user transmission/reception means, then later use the intercepted signal to unlock the vehicle door.

To overcome this problem, the vehicle and user transmission/reception means of the system of the present invention employ circular shift registers for storing a pseudo-random code. Upon transmission of the code from the vehicle transmission/reception means to the user transmission/reception means or vice versa, the receiving de-spreading means will de-spread the received signal unless the pseudo-random code carried by the signal is not synchronized. Synchronization calls for substantial correlation between the pseudo-random code of the received signal with a corresponding stored pseudo-random code by a "shift" less than that which would be required for an intermediate transmission means to intercept the transmitted signal and retransmit a response signal.

For example, in the embodiment illustrated in Figure 2, correlation between the pseudo-random codes is a maximum when the transmission of a signal from one of the transmission/reception means is substantially concomitant with its reception by the other transmission/reception means. On the other hand, the unintended interception of the signal -- e.g., by an ill-intentioned person -- will delay the transmission, varying the

correlation value as a function of the phase shift between the pseudo-random code carried by the received signal and pseudo-random code of the shift register of the receiving transmission/reception means. If the correlation value is too small, then the system does not unlock the vehicle doors.

As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action, "Lambropoulos does not disclose [a] system ... comprising ... means (12, 13, 14) for de-spreading the signal received if the pseudo-random code carried by the said signal is synchronized with a corresponding pseudo-random code stored in their memory means (13) and ... means (6, 7, 8) for de-spreading the signal received if the pseudo-random code carried by the said response signal is synchronized with a corresponding pseudo-random code stored in their memory means (7)." *See Office Action, page 5.*


To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner points to Michaels as allegedly teaching synchronization. However, Michaels fails to disclose the recited synchronization. Thus any rejection of claim 1, and the claims that depend there from, under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper.

Claims 13-24, depending from claim 12 and including all of the subject matter thereof, are respectfully submitted patentable for the above-expressed reasons.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

If, after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner believes that any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned, by telephone, to schedule an interview to address such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew Johnston
Reg. No. 41,996

LINIAK, BERENATO & WHITE
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Telephone: (301) 896-0600
Facsimile: (301) 896-0607